



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,780	09/15/2003	Philippe Bouchard	098501-0305998	7252
909	7590	12/16/2005	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			DELACROIX MUIRHEI, CYBILLE	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA 22102			1614	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/661,780

Applicant(s)

BOUCHARD ET AL.

Examiner

Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22,26-34 and 36-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22,26-34 and 36-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1614

***Detailed Action***

The following is responsive to applicant's amendment received Sep. 27, 2005.

Claims 1-21, 23-25, 35 are cancelled. No new claims are added. Claims 22, 26-34, 36-42 are currently pending.

The previous objection to claims 31 and 36 set forth in paragraph 1 of the office action mailed March 28, 2005 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment and the remarks contained therein.

The previous claim rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, set forth in paragraphs 2-5 of the office action mailed March 28, 2005 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment and the remarks contained therein.

The previous claim rejection under 35 USC 102(a) over Olivennes et al., set forth in paragraph 6 of the office action mailed March 28, 2005 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment and the remarks contained therein.

The previous claim rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over Olivennes et al., set forth in paragraph 7 of the office action mailed March 28, 2005 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment and the remarks contained therein.

However, applicant's amendment necessitates the following new ground(s) of rejection.

***New Ground(s) of Rejection***

***Claim Objection(s)***

Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 4, "administrating" should read --administering--. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejection(s)—35 USC 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 22, 26-34, 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "the improvement" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. If claim 22 is to be a Jepson claim, the proper Jepson claim format should be used.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "clomphencitrate" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1614

Claims 22, 26-34, 36-42 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,319,192. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are generic to all that is recited in the claims 1-6 of USPN '192. That is, the claims of USPN '192 fall entirely within the scope of the claims of the instant application. In other words, the claims of the instant application are anticipated by claims 1-6 of USPN '192. Specifically, the claims of USPN '192 recite a method of therapeutic management of infertility comprising administering an LH-RH antagonist, stimulating ovarian follicle growth, inducing ovulation with HCG, native LHRH, LHRH agonist or recombinant LH and inseminating by sperm injection, wherein the LHRH antagonist administered may be cetrorelix or antarelix and ovarian follicle stimulation is achieved by administration of anti-estrogens. Since, the claims of USPN '192 administer the LHRH antagonist so that endogenous LH is suppressed, maintaining FSH secretion at a natural level without effecting estrogen development would be inherent.

### ***Conclusion***

Claims 22, 26-34, 36-42 are rejected.

Art Unit: 1614

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Cybill Delacroix-Muirheid** whose telephone number is **571-272-0572**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. from 8:30 to 6:00 as well as every other Friday from 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher Low**, can be reached on **571-272-0951**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CDM  
Dec. 12, 2005

  
CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600